JL: Whe you asked me "Is there factual error in Rush to Judgement" I was not up to telling you that is the wrong question & the wrong formulation. I understand his commercialization of footnotes did lead to factual error. But his books can't be separate and error and doctrine also can't be. In the summer of 1968, over a weekend, I wrote a book, A Citizen's Descent. Only Gary Schoener has read it. I haven't. The real reason was what he was doing in N.O. but I would not then let even Ivon see it. The totality of Mark's dishonesty is impossible to conceive and I have always felt it is part of a complex psychological makeup. Until we can talk, of all the things that can be said of R to J I believe the worst is a lawyer editing direct quotes so that commission counsel are always faceless (called counsel rather than by name in the text and names replaced by "Q" in the alleged verbatims) and Warren and Rankin are always identified by name. He was out to get them particularlt Warren, and he made these basic alterations so that the reader hod no other focus for his wrath. In fact, Iwas sent a message by a shocked Mark associate via Jerry Agel in advance of a large Newsweek treatment that R to J's purpose was to give Warren no alternative to suicide. After receiving this message I looked Ken Crawford up for the first time since we knew each other before and in the early days of World War II. If he tried it made no difference. The piece appeared. This doctrine is roughly the equivalent of Epstein's. What he did in Letters from Vietnam, so unnecessary, is a horrible example. But worst of all is Citizen's Dissent. One of countless examples: he got not a farthing from BBC. True. He got $40,000. HW 4/29/75